## COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY CABINET FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES DEPARTMENT FOR MEDICAID SERVICES

IN RE: OPTOMETRIC CARE TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{May 6,2021} \\ \text{1:00 P.M.} \end{array}$  (All Participants Appeared Via Zoom or Telephonically)

## **APPEARANCES**

Matthew Burchett CHAIR

James Sawyer
Steve Compton
Gary Upchurch
Karoline Munson
TAC MEMBER PRESENT

CAPITAL CITY COURT REPORTING TERRI H. PELOSI, COURT REPORTER 900 CHESTNUT DRIVE FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY 40601 (502) 223-1118

\_\_\_\_\_

## APPEARANCES (Continued)

Veronica Cecil Lee Guice John Hoffmann MEDICAID SERVICES

(Court Reporter's Note) At the request of DMS, all other participants appearing via Zoom or telephonically will not be listed under Appearances?

## **AGENDA**

Call to Order

Approval of February 2021 TAC Minutes

Follow-up from last MAC Meeting:

- Reported that KYHealth.net has gone live with the missed appointment check box. Instructions on where/how to mark a missed appointment?
- Discussion on Recoupments

Follow-Up from last TAC Meeting - Do optometrists have to contract with KHIE?

Discussion on PA/Post Authorizations information in each MCO's portal

Avesis: If billing a 92xxx codes as medical and will refraction be paid if it is an approved medical code.

March Vision: Follow-up from last TAC discussions

- Contracting: time table to credential, contracting for exams only?
- Billing issues: taxonomy Code, payment time table, portal issues
- Any frame kit news?

Discussion with all MCOs and Vision Contractors: OMDs and ODs billing to the same entity.

Next TAC Date Scheduled: August 5th at 1pm

MS. CECIL: Hi, everyone. This is Veronica Cecil with Kentucky Medicaid. Sharley is not able to join, so, we have another staffer that's handling the hosting.

And I want to say we have three what I call major meetings going on right now at the same time. And, so, we've had to do our best to allocate resources. So, hopefully, we have the staff attending today that can be of support, but I did want to note that.

DR. BURCHETT: I assume, because I can't see who all is on - let me look here. Yes, it looks like we have enough for a quorum. So, I guess we can go ahead and get started, then.

As usual, I'm Dr. Burchett, the Chair of the TAC, and I think most all the other TAC members are on. I didn't see one that I thought was missing there. So, we'll go ahead and get started.

I would like to say hello and thank Dr. Munson for being on today. I know she has been absent for a little while. So, good to see you back.

And with that, the first item on the agenda is approval of the minutes from the February TAC meeting. Any of you all have any

questions on the minutes from the last meeting? If not, I will have a motion to approve those.

 $\label{eq:decompton:equation} \text{DR. COMPTON: Steve Compton.} \quad \text{I}$  move to approve.

DR. UPCHURCH: Gary Upchurch.

Second.

DR. BURCHETT: Any further discussion on them? If not, then, all in favor of approving the minutes from the last meeting, say aye. And any opposed? Sounded like that was all of you. Good deal.

Moving on to the rest of the agenda, then, I'm going to let Steve take over right here since he's our MAC representative and go over the followup from the last MAC meeting they had.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{DR.}}$  COMPTON: Okay. You caught me off guard here a little bit.

The missed-appointment check box, it's gone live. I think we've already reported over fifty people for no-shows but I haven't seen anything come out from DMS or KOA. Do our providers know about this and how are they going to find out? It seems to be working pretty well.

And the other question is, what happens if somebody misses and they no show all the

time, is there a remedial effort made or where do we go from here is I guess what I'm asking?

DR. BURCHETT: Steve, do you know? I think on the dental side where this originated, I think they actually have a code they can code for reimbursement for no show.

DR. COMPTON: They do but there's no CPT code for that and we can't use the dental codes.

MS. CECIL: So, to clarify,
Medicaid does not allow to reimburse for a no-show,
for a missed appointment for any provider type.

DR. COMPTON: Right, but will there be any - I mean, if you've got a patient that habitually no shows with their providers and it shows up on this report, is somebody going to contact them and say, hey, look? What's the next step, I guess, is what I'm asking?

MS. CECIL: I think we have somebody from Policy on board, but you're correct. I think the hope is that the information will be shared, especially with the Managed Care Organizations for any Managed Care members so that they can outreach to find out what's going on, do a little care management around why a person may be

missing appointments. It could be transportation, child care. I think it will help us identify are there barriers to accessing that care.

DR. COMPTON: We will generally ask. If it's a pretty legitimate reason, we don't even report it but some folks just don't show up.

And this is similar to the ER use. You track that.

If somebody is always going to the Emergency Room when they could be going to their primary care, I think there's some sort of mediation for that. It's only been live a month.

MS. CECIL: That's right and we don't have a lot of uptick in use of it yet and we certainly hope that that will increase.

 $\label{eq:decompton:interpolation} \mbox{DR. COMPTON: I'm not sure}$  people know it's there.

MS. CECIL: I think Eddie

Newsome is on. Are you aware of how this has been

communicated to providers? I'm trying to see if he's

on.

MR. HOFFMANN: Veronica, this is John Hoffmann. I think they're planning on putting this on the DMS website promoting this. I think I saw some language recently going through for approval.

1 MS. CECIL: Okay. Thank you. 2 Let us take that back. I think there were plans to 3 put it on KyHealth.net, and we certainly shared it with the MAC and TACs. We rely on you guys to share 4 5 it with your all's association and membership. So, I believe that that was 6 7 shared that way but we'll go back and make sure that 8 there's a definite communication plan around it. 9 DR. BURCHETT: If that's something you all would like for us to reach out to 10 our membership and association, we definitely could 11 12 do that. 13 MS. CECIL: Yes, absolutely. 14 That would be fantastic. 15 DR. BURCHETT: Okay. DR. COMPTON: And the discussion 16 on recoupments, I'm a little bit at a loss there 17 18 other than we will occasionally get a recoupment two 19 years after the fact. Of course, you can't get it 20 from the patient at that point. 21 22 23

24

25

That may have been discussed at the MAC meeting but I'm at a loss as to what was Somebody else may have something to add here. DR. BURCHETT: No, Steve. only thing I would say on recoupments that I can

think about would be like you just said. Sometimes two and three years out, we will get a letter from a provider (sic) saying they're going to recoup for whatever reason. And like you said, we have no ability to recoup that from the patients at all.

So, my question probably would be how long can they go out for recoupments?

DR. COMPTON: We've got six

months for timely filing or a year or whatever it is.

I think there should be some sort of window that when it's closed, it's closed.

And that may be a policy thing. I don't know who sets that policy, if it's each MCO or subcontractor or if that's set by DMS. I guess that would be the place to start to see where the rule comes from.

MS. CECIL: My understanding is that the Managed Care Organizations, based on the Department of Insurance regulations and statutes, are permitted to go back two years.

So, the process for that obviously - and what I'm not sure about is if that's from date of payment - it may be - but the process for that is elongated based on the two years. I think time runs from when the provider is also

notified of that. So, they can go back two years and, then, it may take a year or two or three sometimes for the process to happen where they requested records but there should be provider notification along with that and, then, the recoupment can occur. Of course, there's appeal rights that go with that.

So, I do believe it's two years from the date of, and, like I said, I don't know if it's service or reimbursement.

DR. COMPTON: And I think ours are typically eligibility.

MS. CECIL: So, keep in mind the caveat to all that is CMS does require us, we are not permitted to reimburse for services that - let me rephrase that.

If the person is not eligible, we're not allowed to reimburse for those services, and retroactive eligibility does happen. It's impossible to make that 100% without that.

Trust me, we completely understand the burden that comes with that but we have to follow CMS rules on that.

DR. COMPTON: It sounds like it just is what it is kind of thing.

1 MS. CECIL: It is. That's why 2 we really try as much as possible to clean up 3 eligibility and to ensure on the front end that we're 4 catching and ensuring that people are eligible. 5 My understanding is that it 6 improved enormously over the years, especially around 7 incarceration. Does that mean it's perfect? No. 8 It's just not going to be a perfect system; but, really, if a person is determined ineligible, we have 9 no choice but to recoup those funds. 10 DR. COMPTON: All right. 11 That's all I've got, Matt. 12 you. DR. BURCHETT: Are you sure, 13 Steve? 14 15 DR. COMPTON: At least on this 16 topic. 17 DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Thank you, 18 Steve. 19 The next item it looks like is 20 follow-up from our last TAC meeting. We had a small 21 discussion about do we have to contract with KHIE, 22 and my memory is about as bad as it can be anymore, 23 but it seems like that was in some of our Medicaid

contracts that came out.

24

25

talked with Nicole from Avesis on that.

MS. ALLEN: Yes, and the contract language is actually in the MCO's contract with DMS. You won't find that exact language within your contact with Avesis.

And it's not that you must register for the KHIE secure to transfer medical records but it's that if you can register to participate in the secure email system so that KHIE gives you the ability to send secure emails and receive secure emails from DMS but you don't have to participate in the medical record transfer or medical records-sharing option that KHIE offers.

I know most dental and some of the eye care providers' operational systems are not compatible with KHIE, but DMS is requiring, according to the new contract, that you participate in the secure email sharing.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. I think that answers my question on it because I wasn't really sure what the thing was meant to get toward, the point of the sign-up, the secure email.

Now, do we know if that includes if our current medical records systems have secure emails built in, we still have to sign up?

1 MS. ALLEN: I'll defer to DMS to 2 answer that question. I apologize. I don't know. 3 DR. BURCHETT: That's fine. 4 Thank you. 5 MR. MIRACLE: I can actually jump in. And, I'm sorry, this is Dale with Avesis. 6 7 So, it's a direct secure messaging and that's direct 8 secure messaging with the KHIE site, with the 9 Kentucky Health Information Exchange site. So, it's a separate system, so 10 11 to speak. So, your secure email is great but it's a separate secure messaging system that you have to 12 13 register for. 14 DR. BURCHETT: Okay. That makes 15 it a little different, then, I guess. So, thank you. 16 MR. MIRACLE: You're welcome. 17 DR. BURCHETT: Any questions on that from the TAC members? 18 19 DR. MUNSON: Yes, Matt. This is 20 Karoline. If that is in the contracts, is that 21 something that's going to change because the current 22 contracts have been thrown out and they're going to 23 rebid or is that something that is going to stay? 24 And that's probably a DMS

question, but I would be curious if that is

25

1	enforceable now if the contracts have been thrown
2	out.
3	MS. CECIL: So, the contracts
4	haven't been thrown out. What the Judge's Order said
5	is the requirement to rebid. So, current contracts
6	are still effective and enforced.
7	DR. MUNSON: so, then, when they
8	are rebid, this could be something that could change,
9	then?
10	MS. CECIL: For a future date,
11	yes.
12	DR. MUNSON: But for right now,
13	we are still bound by the current contracts that are
14	enforced?
15	MS. CECIL: That's correct.
16	DR. MUNSON: Which this is
17	included in.
18	MS. CECIL: That's correct.
19	DR. MUNSON: Okay.
20	DR. BURCHETT: Any other
21	questions?
22	MS. UNGER: This is Sarah with
23	KOA. Is there a timeline? Has this been
24	communicated to the optometrists in the state with
25	the contracts? If they have to do this, is there a

little bit more information or something on behalf of the Association that can be sent out?

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  ALLEN: I can try to take the first shot at answering that.

The way that the contract is written, it applies to newly-contracted providers.

So, existing providers, they may grandfather them in at a later date, but at this point, the way the contract language is written, it applies to new providers.

Providers that are newly credentialed, they have to register for KHIE secure email within thirty days from their effective date, from their effective credential date.

And, Veronica or anyone else from DMS, please correct me if I misstated anything. And if you're speaking, you may still be on mute.

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$  CECIL: I have nothing to offer. That was correct.

DR. BURCHETT: Sarah, that might be information that we probably need to check on with the membership of the Association because I don't remember me seeing any of that, but, of course, I'm not a new provider. So, maybe I didn't see it because of that.

1	MS. ALLEN: I can share that for
2	Avesis, in our new provider contract packets, there
3	is information regarding KHIE in the new
4	credentialing packet information that goes out to
5	providers.
6	DR. BURCHETT: Is that all
7	providers, Nicole?
8	MS. ALLEN: Yes.
9	MS. GILBERTSON: And that's
10	included. We have some messaging on that as well.
11	DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Fair
12	enough. Thank you all.
13	If there's no other discussion
14	there, then, I guess we'll move on to the next item
15	and that would be something that Dr. Munson has
16	brought to the group's attention. So, I'll let her
17	speak on that.
18	DR. MUNSON: Thanks, Matt. So,
19	this is not new. We've discussed this in the past to
20	try to get a better idea of either prior
21	authorizations or post authorizations for each MCO.
22	We've been told in the past,
23	it's on the portal. Just go to the portal and find
24	it.

25

I will give Avesis a shout-out.

Theirs is on the portal. It's easy to find. You might need some reading glasses to look at it but it has every detail you could ever want about all codes that we would bill.

Now, going into the other MCOs' websites was not nearly as fluid or easy to find.

So, what I would like for us as a provider group is to have some easier access for this information and something that is a little more transparent.

So, if we have a patient sitting in our office that has Anthem MCO and needed a bandage lens, we need to know if we can take care of that patient and treat them appropriately for what they need.

And I feel like if we can have this information up front, that it would just help us take better care of this patient population that we're trying to serve.

So, Avesis is off the hook, but for the other MCOs, I would really like a clear path to finding this information as opposed to just telling you it's on our portal.

MR. IRBY: Dr. Munson, this is Greg from UHC. If I could just ask clarification there. When you say this information, can you help

me understand what information is readily available on Avesis' site that's not elsewhere?

DR. MUNSON: So, it's titled

Kentucky Medicaid Optometrists' Fee Schedule. And in

their fee schedule, it notes the CPT code. It notes

the reimbursement for place of service 11 which is

the office. It says global days. It has a column

that says prior authorization and it also has a

column that says post review. And, then, it also has

frequency and whether or not it's per eye.

So, within this I'm assuming it's an Excel document, but within this spreadsheet, I am able to see anything I would need to know for each code that we are able to be billed and reimbursed for.

MR. IRBY: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate it.

DR. MUNSON: So, not hearing any of the other MCOs, I'm going to just ask if that's something that we can have that information given back to us.

I'm not sure if that is something that I want to task it being emailed to Sarah without her consent, but if that's an easier way to have that emailed as opposed to just saying it

verbally, that would be fantastic. If there are actual screen shots to walk through where it is on the portal, that would be wonderful, too.

If it is not readily available, then, I would ask that if there are those documents available maybe in-house, that that would be something that could be sent over and, then, that would be something that can be disseminated to our members, again, so this patient population can be appropriately taken care of.

MR. RANDALL: Hi. This is

Jeremy Randall with Anthem. And I just want to say
that your request makes sense. I understand what
you're asking and we will respond accordingly.

DR. MUNSON: I appreciate that.

MS. MEDINA: This is Christina

Medina from EyeQuest. I think Jeremy must have been
on the same wave length there.

Most definitely, I think it might just be a matter of just kind of a walk thru, kind of putting a guide together on how to access our information because we definitely have all of that readily available but we want to make sure you guys are familiar with those resources and know how to access that information so that it can be convenient

and allow for the best experience as you all service the membership. So, we'll definitely take that as a takeaway.

DR. DAVIS: This is John Davis from EyeQuest. Just to follow up, right now, that information is available in the office reference manual anytime, but putting it on the portal in a lot more detail, that's not a bad idea.

We'll look into that for sure, but right now it's available to you just looking at our ORM. It's a very short list of services that require a PA.

DR. MUNSON: So, where would an office reference manual live, then? Is that something that an insurance and billing department would have or is that in a packet when people sign up?

DR. DAVIS: When you sign up, you're directed to the portal and it says download this ORM if you want a written copy. It's there available to you or you can just page through it right now.

DR. MUNSON: So, if we logged into the portal, we could get to that but, then, we would have to go through it to find what requires a

1 PA. 2 DR. DAVIS: Right. Right. DR. MUNSON: Okay. 3 And, so, I 4 think that that's part of the problem is that, yes, 5 it is on the portal, but, like you said, it is buried and it's just not as easily accessible and that's why 6 unfortunately the only one I found was Avesis. 7 8 So, that would be fantastic for 9 EyeQuest and Anthem to have that, and, then, also for the other MCOs to follow suit. 10 11 MS. GILBERTSON: We can get that 12 step by step to Sarah to disseminate to your group. 13 DR. MUNSON: Awesome. 14 That's all I had on that, Matt. you. 15 MS. ASHER: Dr. Munson, can you 16 hear me? DR. MUNSON: Yes, ma'am. 17 MS. ASHER: I'm Sammie Asher. 18 19 I'm with Aetna Better Health of Kentucky. We 20 actually do have some Powerpoint slides to point you in the right direction to get to that information on 21 our website. We do supply that information on our 22 23 website, not necessarily inside the portal.

there as well, but it is a little easier to get to

through our website.

24

25

1 So, I would like to get that 2 over to you guys, just those slides, so you will have 3 that. 4 DR. MUNSON: Correct me if I'm 5 wrong. Is Aetna still not using Avesis as their vision contractor? 6 7 MS. ASHER: We are. 8 DR. MUNSON: I'll be honest. 9 Yours is already on the Avesis portal. So, as long as there aren't any other services that Aetna 10 themselves cover that Avesis doesn't which I know 11 12 some of the MCOs did, usually Avesis wasn't one of 13 them. So, Avesis has kind of done it all for you. 14 So, you guys are good. 15 MS. ALLEN: Thank you, Dr. 16 Munson. MS. ASHER: Great. Perfect. 17 18 MS. ALLEN: And, Sammie, we can 19 follow up with you offline just to make sure that 20 there's no questions, but, yes, Dr. Munson, you're 21 100% correct. Thank you. 22 DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Any other 23 discussion there? 24 If not, let's move on.

next question is for Avesis. I've had some questions

25

on people that have billed the 9200 codes for medical services with a refraction when indicated for various conditions. The refraction has not been paid on those. Is that something that is ripe or is there some kind of issue there that we're not seeing?

DR. LEVY: No, that's not the case. It hasn't changed since we've been doing it over these past years.

So, if a provider puts in the appropriate medical diagnosis and points to that medical diagnosis and has the provider refraction, it will pay.

Part of a routine eye exam we incorporated include our refraction within that exam. So, it's included there and it wouldn't pay, but nothing has changed.

So, if you could, provide us some instances here and let's make sure that this particular provider or if there are providers, make sure they're pointing in the right direction for that medical diagnosis; and if not, it's a good education opportunity that we can work with them, but if it's not and it's something on our side, I need to know that.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. So, just

1 for instance, a diabetic exam billed with a 9200 2 code, that would pay refraction on that? 3 DR. LEVY: Yes, sir. DR. BURCHETT: Just to be clear. 4 5 Sounds good. Okay. And, then, the other one, Dan, 6 7 since you're on, this is actually something that has 8 come up in my office - the referring versus the 9 rendering providers. We got an email from our rep 10 last week saying that that's no longer the case; but 11 this morning on the phone talking with one of the 12 13 people we call into, they said, no, that it would still be denied if we didn't have it the way it was 14 15 before it was supposed to be fixed. 16 So, what's the true word on that? 17 18 DR. LEVY: Nicole, do you want 19 to give us an update on that, please? 20 MS. ALLEN: Sure. So, the 21 information that you received last week was correct, Dr. Burchett. The rendering provider and the 22 23 referring provider, they can match. We have

realigned our policy to align with DMS.

24

25

the name of the individual that you spoke with at Avesis, then, that way we can do some re-education with the team. We are re-educating the staff.

So, I can see that someone may have made a mistake and communicated the incorrect information; but if you don't remember their name, that's okay. We'll just do a re-education for everyone.

DR. BURCHETT: I apologize. Off the top of my head, I don't have it but I can reach out to my billing staff and see if they've got it.

MS. ALLEN: Okay. If they do, great. If they don't, don't worry about it. We'll re-educate everyone, but, yes.

And there is another notification that will be mailed out. It's currently with all of the MCOs and DMS for approval. So, as soon as we get approval, which DMS, if I may say, you guys have been awesome with getting our letters reviewed and back like within two or three business days - it's been wonderful - but as soon as we get that notice back approved, you will receive an updated letter so that you have something in writing from us to show you in writing that the process has been revised.

And if I may also take a second to explain that we are also going back and reprocessing the claims that processed under the old policy. You don't have to resubmit anything. We'll handle it on our end. It's a simple report to identify all the claims that denied for that reason and we'll go back and reprocess them.

DR. BURCHETT: Sounds good. Thank you. Anybody else have anything to add to that?

If not, we will move on. The next item is the followup from all of our discussions with March Visions from last TAC meeting. I just wanted to check in and see on some of the issues that have come to light, how we were doing.

And if someone would like to speak on that from March, but I think we had some trouble looking at the things here from getting contracted and what type of contracting we could do for exam medical services only without doing materials, things like that was the first item.

MS. FERRER: Hi. This is

Adrianne Ferrer. I'm the Director of Network

Development for March Vision Care, and I can say that
things have really quieted down a bit.

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25

We're averaging maybe about forty-five days for the contracting cycle and that includes credentialing and loading the providers into our system. So, we're looking really good on that.

There are some caveats to that as there have been providers that have some language issues that need to be addressed and take a little bit of a longer time to work through, but, in general, we're looking at about forty-five days from start to finish.

And, yes, we are absolutely contracting for exams only for medical. So, we are able to do that. We do have providers that are currently doing that right now - exams only. So, we don't seem to be having any additional requests for that or issues on that particular issue.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Any TAC members have any issues there that they have encountered as well or people have talked with you about?

Hearing none, the next one is billing issues that some providers have had. I know initially I think we might have even had this same problem with the taxonomy codes, having some issue to have claims go through being denied for not having

the right taxonomy code.

I think that might have been for us a portal versus a clearinghouse issue. And, then, we've had some people call in and talk with us about not being paid in a timely manner, I think.

So, any discussion there?

MS. KLINGELHOFER: Hi. This is
Tyania Klingelhofer and I am the Director for Network
Service for the State of Kentucky. I have spoken to
many of you just recently in the past couple of
weeks. So, I'm happy to be here today to give you
some updates.

So, regarding the taxonomy billing issues that we have encountered, there are a mixture of issues for denials. So, I'm just going to take it step by step.

Some claims are denying because there is no taxonomy submitted for billing or rendering or both.

And, then, we had a configuration issue between EDI and our system and we did get some assistance from our IT teams and from Dr. Sawyer that helped us troubleshoot, and we have found the issue and the issue was resolved as of Tuesday, May 4<sup>th</sup>. So, I'm very happy to relay that

information to all of you today.

We do have a claims

reprocessing project that is underway. Our teams are working to identify the claims that need to be reprocessed due to those claim denials.

And, then, I do want to let this team know that we are going to put an enhancement on eyeSynergy that will have a hard stop for providers so that we can ensure that we are getting a taxonomy code submitted for both rendering and billing, and, then, up front we will let you know if that taxonomy matches with the State file or not.

So, that should alleviate a lot of the claims denials that are coming in without taxonomy codes.

As far as the payments go, we do pay within thirty days - usually sooner but we'll go with thirty days as our max for a majority of our claims.

We run a check three times a week for all clients that are picked up for their claim if the claim is processed and ready.

MS. HULEN: Hi. This is Angel Hulen from March. I would suspect that if there are delays that they may be contributing from those

1	denials that we've seen from taxonomy. However, if
2	you have examples or things we should look into
3	beyond those denials and times being paid, then, we
4	can definitely do that.
5	MS. KLINGELHOFER: Thank you,
6	Angel.
7	DR. COMPTON: This is Steve
8	Compton. So, am I to understand the taxonomy issue
9	is solved and we can begin using the clearinghouse
10	again?
11	MS. KLINGELHOFER: Yes.
12	DR. COMPTON: Do we still have
13	to get on a portal and get some sort of authorization
14	number?
15	MS. KLINGELHOFER: A
16	confirmation?
17	DR. COMPTON: Yes.
18	MS. KLINGELHOFER: Yes.
19	Confirmations are required.
20	DR. COMPTON: Okay. That puts
21	just one more step in the process. I don't do the
22	billing. I don't think we have to do that with
23	anybody else.
24	MS. HULEN: That is our process
25	to basically hold the eligibility and benefits for

you and confirm them through our website.

DR. COMPTON: Okay. It's just one more administrative step for, quite frankly, a fee that's a lot less than normal anyway. So, just some food for thought. If you can get around that somehow and make it smoother, it would be nice.

DR. SAWYER: This is James
Sawyer. I'm using CompuLink. I don't think there's
any place to put that in, a confirmation number.

DR. COMPTON: We use CompuLink as well. They just have to do something. I don't know. We haven't been able to get paid with the clearinghouse anyway. So, we'll have to see.

DR. SAWYER: Tyania and I were talking about the taxonomy code doesn't show anywhere in CompuLink's billing transaction screen and she found that it was there. It's in the background somewhere and that's kind of the same thing I'm thinking on this confirmation number. I don't think we're going to run into a place that there's an empty box to put it in.

MS. FERRER; And this is
Adrianne. If the confirmation is not on the claim or
in the EDI submission, as long as it's generated in
our system, it will bump up against that. So, the

system is smart enough to know that one was requested. And we always encourage the confirmation because of, of course, eligibility and benefits that are often used. Members sometimes go to get services, these services without letting the provider know, another provider know.

But, yeah, it will bump into the system if it's not on the claim or the EDI submission. So, it's still there and it will pay it out accordingly.

DR. BURCHETT: Any other discussion there? Any questions about the answers they've given? Good. Thank you all.

The last thing we had there under March Vision looks like I think last time there might have been some discussion on providing a frame kit. Is that something that is going to happen or just not at this time?

MS. HULEN: Can't make any promises yet. That is our goal. We would like to be able to achieve that. We're working through some operational pieces to see what the timing would look like with that. So, just bear with us but definitely still on the radar.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Thank you

all.

The next item I'm going to hold for just a second because I actually have a question for the Department and it goes back to the Judge's ruling. Is there any news on when they're going to put out the new RFP's, any kind of time line or is it still too early to know anything like that?

MS. CECIL: It is definitely too early to know. There are appeal rights to that Order. So, I have a feeling this isn't over.

So, until something is final, then, the Department will make the decision on next steps.

DR. BURCHETT: Okay. Thank you. And I've got one more question for you, too, if you want to hang on just a minute.

We had a provider call in to us and say that they have a patient who is an adult and has the traditional fee-for-service Kentucky Medicaid and that that adult's caseworker says that they have a benefit for materials for glasses available to them.

And we didn't know if there was any kind of special waiver or anything like that that would have allowed for that because traditionally

they don't have material benefits as an adult and we didn't know if there's something out there that we just didn't know about for that. MS. CECIL: I'm not aware. don't know if - let me look and see if----MS. GUICE: I'm on. MS. CECIL: Thank you. MS. GUICE: Is it adults, Dr. Burchett, over twenty-one? Do you know? DR. BURCHETT: Yes. I think that the information was coming from their caseworker but I don't think their caseworker could produce exactly anything other than they said that they had benefits for glasses. MS. GUICE: Okay. So, it's likely, without knowing anything else about the individual, it's very likely that the adult has a waiver and that waiver may or may not provide that benefit. Certainly it's not part of the regular feefor-service. The only way I can answer that question for sure about that individual is to have someone send me that information and let me check

that specific individual.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

DR. BURCHETT: That's fine.

Ι

1 We'll reach back out and try to get some more 2 information for you, then. 3 MS. GUICE: Okay. Great. 4 Thanks. 5 DR. BURCHETT: Appreciate it, 6 Lee. 7 So, the last thing on the 8 agenda that I have and the extra questions I had 9 there - thank you all for answering those, by the way - and, Steve, I think you're the one that usually 10 11 heads up this discussion when we have it, but the 12 last few times that contracts have been put out, 13 we've tried to send up to the MAC to have it put in with them about contracting vision versus medical 14 15 from the avenue of us doing medical services and 16 vision services as well. And since we didn't get a 17 chance to discuss it much last time before the last 18 19 contracts were put out, I thought we might open it 20 back up if there's a chance that new contracts would 21 be put out. 22 DR. COMPTON: Do you want my 23 comments?

DR. BURCHETT: Well, thoughts,

24

25

yes.

DR. COMPTON: Historically, we made this recommendation a couple of years ago and, then, all the different changes in contracts and changes in Administration, this, that and the other.

We made it again about this time last year to be presented to the MAC but, then, everything shut down and post-dated to that, the new bids were let. So, it really wasn't considered, I don't think, when the bids were let.

I guess the example I'd use is if someone has conjunctivitis, pink eye, they go to the nurse practitioner. They don't bill the vision plan, just different things.

I've just always felt like with medical versus vision in the commercial world, we'd bill the medical stuff to the medical insurance and the vision stuff to the vision plan, but, to me, there's a disconnect there - discongruity. Is that a word? I can't spell it.

I'd like for it to be considered when the new bids go out.

DR. BURCHETT: And I know in the past, we've had issues when Medicaid was the secondary payer in certain situations. Like, I think cataract surgery, co-management, things like that

have been an issue, if I remember right.

DR. LEVY: Matt, is this open for dialogue or is this something you're asking the State?

DR. BURCHETT: It's something we're discussing.

DR. LEVY: Got it.

DR. COMPTON: That seems to be where most of our hiccups occur is when we bill medical to the subcontractors. And, granted, it's better than it used to be.

DR. BURCHETT: Well, would it be something that we would want to entertain making a motion to send it back to the MAC in case there are new contracts let?

DR. COMPTON: What does Dr.

Munson and Dr. Sawyer and Dr. Upchurch think?

DR. MUNSON: I guess if you look at historically when we just had the Department for Medicaid Services paying claims, what we refer to as traditional Medicaid, the question would be did some of those issues exist? Did providers have trouble getting paid for vision services versus medical claims? And, then, is that something that there has been more of an undue burden on either system, you

1 know, the payer or the provider? 2 And if we are running into 3 issues with that now and we didn't have them 4 previous, that's something that we might actually 5 think about. So, I don't know the answers to 6 7 those but that would be something that would point us 8 in the right direction. 9 DR. DAVIS: This is John Davis from EyeQuest. Can I opine or comment? Matt, would 10 11 that be all right? 12 DR. BURCHETT: Yes, that's fine. 13 DR. DAVIS: I'm trying to figure 14 out - I'm trying to understand the problem, what the 15 issue is. 16 So, you say conjunctivitis. You bill the vision vendor in Kentucky. That's one 17 of the reasons they carve out all of the services to 18 19 We speak your language theoretically, the vendor. 20 right? So, we know what conjunctivitis is versus 21 let's say that the next patient that walks in your door has a routine eye exam and let's say they need 22 23 glasses.

24

25

Well, you're going to bill all those services to the same payer, I mean, right?

You're going to bill instead of Anthem it's EyeQuest in this example.

So, every claim you do, everything you do, your entire scope of practice is billed to one entity. Doesn't that make it kind of logical? That's what I'm trying to figure out - the problem. What am I missing? I don't get it, I guess.

DR. COMPTON: I brought it up two or three years ago because we had a lot of hiccups, a lot of issues.

Your PCP or your nurse prac or whoever treats that patient for the same condition doesn't bill vision just because vision knows what conjunctivitis is. I mean, the medical plans know, too. It's not the same as we do everything else.

If a patient has Anthem and EyeMed, we bill Anthem if they're a diabetic. If it's a routine, we bill EyeMed or BlueVision or whatever it is.

DR. DAVIS: So, again, just to help me understand it, so, it seems like it's a burden to you all to have to bill two separate entities, I mean, to figure out who gets billed for that particular visit maybe.

I know you're used to it because optometry is used to dealing with a commercial eye company, a vision plan, a commercial vision plan. So, it's pretty common.

Let me give you this example, right? So, a patient comes in. They're coming in for an annual visit. They want to update their glasses, whatever and, I don't know, their cupping is asymmetric, whatever.

You say let's do a baseline field here just because we've never seen him before or we don't know what that means. Let's go ahead and run that 92250.

So, you do that on that patient. Then, in that example, you would have to split that claim, then, right? You would bill the vision vendor for the 92004 and you would then bill the 92250 to the medical carrier, I assume. It just seems like that's more of a problem or more of a hassle factor than just billing the payer, the correct payer.

Do you know what I mean?

Again, I feel like I'm missing something. Sorry.

DR. COMPTON: I guess part of

it, too, is optometrists can be pretty sensitive to

being treated differently than the rest of the medical community. When the rest of them bill one entity and we bill another, I don't know, it just kind of leaves a bad taste in some of us, I'd say.

DR. LEVY: On the agenda, Dr. Compton, it says discussion with all MCOs and Vision Contractors: OMD's and OD's billing to the same entity.

I don't want to speak for Dr.

Davis, but you know how we do it. We treat our optometrists as we treat our opthamologists. Being a single-source payer allows for way better patient compliance, continuity of care.

I can agree with you. There were hiccups along the way. We've been with you guys for a long time and we've worked out a lot of things, the last being that we changed the billing system being based on diagnosis-driven has made it easier for everybody.

But to Dr. Davis' point, when we look at the specialty of eye care and offering a single payer, I will tell you that the optometric claims coming in on the medical side and the advancement and scope of care in Kentucky that you are providing is vast.

I mean, I will say that you're probably in this state producing more primary and secondary and tertiary care and more of the ophthalmology is staying in the surgical suite than any state, and I think it is because of that single source and being able to have a single payer.

And the other thing is we use the example of nurses and PCP's. The contracts are the same when it comes to provider agreements, right? It's all based on the scope of care and licensure in that state.

So, when I look at claims and I look at what an optometrist is providing in Kentucky that they can be able to do right then and there when that patient is in their exam room is much greater than when it is split out because we see it split out and we see the services tend just to be routine.

In this case, in this state, your services are so much more medically advanced than other states.

And, again, I'm just telling you based on looking at the claims because, as Dr. Davis stated, all we do is look at eye care claims, be they come from an ophthalmologist or a specialty low-vision optometrist. We get to see all of that

stuff, that 5% of the body that comes in to us as a single source. Be it an optometrist with that taxonomy or an ophthalmologist, we treat all folks the same so that you guys can provide the services and get paid accordingly.

DR. COMPTON: And you made a point. When you came in to Kentucky, you were paying a lot more medical claims than you had been used to paying and maybe that's what triggered the issues and the original discussion. It is better now than it once was.

DR. DAVIS: And, again, I'm not speaking for Avesis but I think all of us, our intent is to minimize your administrative burden and that's one of the reasons we like you to just bill the one entity.

And even to the PA stuff, the prior approval stuff, I know at EyeQuest, we've got that pared down to pretty much the essential very few codes that require a prior approval because we just don't want you to have to be bothered with it, frankly, and I think Avesis does the same thing at this point.

And, by the way, when we get a PA from an ophthalmologist for whatever, an eye

23

24

25

laser, we do the same thing with them. Nothing has changed. Nothing is different for ophthalmology with us versus the OD's in Kentucky.

DR. COMPTON: And that may be a concern, too. We just have to be ever vigilant.

DR. DAVIS: Yes, and that's

DR. COMPTON: I may be confused. One time we did bill Anthem for the medical and

DR. DAVIS: I don't think so. If you did, you didn't get paid by Anthem. have had to then turn that claim around.

DR. COMPTON: I wouldn't place

DR. DAVIS: And, by the way, just so that you know, if that happens by accident, now, if an OD or one of our contracted providers bills Anthem for an eye service that we cover, but we have a really good system now that seamlessly reverses that claim right back around to us from Anthem. That might have been part of some of the problem back in the day, too, because Anthem would not pay it just because of whatever reason. weren't contracting with you or whatever.

And, so, we created a system a couple of years ago which made that a really seamless thing. You don't even know. And we do still get some of those claims that the OD's bill to Anthem maybe from habit or because their clearinghouse is set up to send it to them or whatever, but, then, they flip

So, you no longer get a denial from Anthem I think is what I'm saying which could have been some of the friction you're talking about, too, because that's annoying. Then, you say, oh, shoot, we've got to bill these people now and you know how that goes.

back to us and you don't even know it.

DR. COMPTON: Okay. I like that.

DR. LEVY: At the end of the day, John and I are both optometrists and very pro optometry. I actually took this job because I was quite frankly tired of just the routine eye exam eight years ago.

I'm here doing this eight years now and just the routine eye exam and not being able to have that immediate continuity of care when the patient is in the exam chair and that's really how we developed our program. It was more optometric driven

than medically or ophthalmology driven when we put our program together.

So, I do want you to keep that in mind. To be able to do it the way we do it here in this state and other states, you know, when we were talking years ago and they were thinking about that there was a lack of importance for an annual or a routine eye exam and I shared with you folks that we have all the medical services that come out of a routine eye exam, all of those other medical diagnoses, it's staggering. And where do they mostly come from? Optometrists.

So, just keep that in mind.

You guys are impacting - and I can only tell you that because, again, I see the claims.

So, when I see a routine eye exam for a pair of glasses and I see the secondary, tertiary and the fourth diagnosis is something else, and, then, I'll go back and check in to that office and see that they provide followup care for those medical services that they found on an annual or routine eye exam, it's amazing. I see that much greater on the optometry side than I do on the ophthalmology side.

DR. COMPTON: So, I think we

just leave this and we may discuss it again in a year and we'll see how it goes.

DR. BURCHETT: That's what I was going to suggest, Steve. Let's just table this and revisit it if we need to in the future. Fair enough?

And thank you all for the dialogue on that. It' much appreciated. We always like to try to have open lines of communication with you.

So, I'll just ask the TAC if there's any other items that they had that didn't make it on the agenda that might be able to be fixed real quick, a yes or no answer or something like that before we get ready to dismiss here?

DR. MUNSON: Hey, Matt, it's Karoline. I do have two questions, one that I was absent for the meeting when Durysta was brought up.

I know that since that meeting which was two meetings ago, the State has added it to the Covered Services' list, and all of the MCOs said as long as it's on the Covered Services' List, that that is something that they would be covering.

So, the question, then, because there is an expense to it, it kind of goes back to my old question about prior authorizations which I would

1 assume that would need, and, then, if all of the MCOs 2 have also assigned their reimbursement amount for 3 that. 4 So, in looking at the PA or 5 post-authorizations, if they could also make sure 6 that that has been added to their list and, then, 7 that there's a reimbursement assigned to that. 8 That's one thing. 9 And if any MCOs have a comment or already know that answer, that's great; but if 10 11 not, if that could be added. DR. DAVIS: I'm sorry. 12 the code? 13 14 DR. MUNSON: It's for Durysta. 15 DR. DAVIS: Oh, Durysta. Oh, 16 yes. Okay. 17 MS. ALLEN: Dr. Munson, can you 18 give us the procedure code if you have it? 19 DR. MUNSON: Not off the top of 20 my head. 21 DR. LEVY: Nicole, we're all set up. We're all set. There's a clinical protocol and 22 23 guideline written already and we've already come up with a price point. And, Karoline, I'm not sure. 24

I'm pretty sure it's on our fee schedule.

25

Lorenetta is on. Lorenetta, is it on our fee 1 2 schedule? Are you there? 3 MS. ALLEN: I don't think 4 Lorenetta is on, Dr. Levy. 5 DR. LEVY: Oh, okay. I thought I saw her name on. We can get back to you on that 6 7 but I wrote the clinical protocol and guideline for 8 it. 9 So, I'm pretty sure it's on there and I know we had to do a little research to 10 11 come up with a fee because there really wasn't a fee but I'm almost sure it was added, but we can 12 13 certainly get back to you on that. DR. MUNSON: Yes, because this 14 15 one I have doesn't have any J codes on it and I know 16 there's two codes that go with it. DR. LEVY: You're right. You're 17 18 right. 19 DR. MUNSON: So, I'll have to 20 see if there is a new one on the portal that has that 21 added to it. 22 DR. LEVY: Okay. 23 DR. DAVIS: Dr. Compton brought 24 that up at the last meeting and we did take action on

I have to check the status on it, though.

25

I'll make sure I follow up with that myself for EyeQuest.

DR. MUNSON: Okay. Thank you all.

And, then, one other question and I don't know if this is an Avesis question or a WellCare question, and this came to my attention yesterday for a patient calling in that WellCare only, not the other MCOs that Avesis services, is providing a benefit for their adults.

It is \$150 for glasses or contact lenses and that is something that I just want to see if someone could speak to as far as if that covers a fitting fee and if there's anywhere they can point me to some better direction on it.

We were told that we had to add a benefit grid to our website which that didn't make any sense to me either. So, if there's any information that can be given about that, I'd appreciate it.

DR. LEVY: So, we can get that to you or we can share it here, but it is a \$150 benefit. It's a value-added benefit for that adult population and the CLEFUP - contact lens evaluation followup - I love that acronym - is not covered. So,

1 you would be able to use that pool of money for 2 either their eye wear and/or their contact lenses but 3 the fitting would be on the member. Do I have that 4 right, Nicole? 5 MS. ALLEN: Yes, you have it 6 right. 7 DR. MUNSON: And, so, is that a straight dollar amount as far as reimbursement? 8 9 if we bill \$150, we are reimbursed \$150? DR. LEVY: You are not, no. 10 The member has \$150 for them to allocate. You are 11 reimbursed a different amount of that, a percentage 12 13 of that. And, again, we could get you that plan 14 sheet if you don't have it. 15 DR. MUNSON: I would love that. 16 DR. LEVY: Okay. You've got it. DR. MUNSON: And is that 17 18 reimbursement, the allocated amount or percentage, is 19 that the same percentage whether they choose glasses 20 or contact lenses? 21 DR. LEVY: That is correct. 22 That is correct. 23 DR. MUNSON: Okay. That was the only thing that was new and we were trying to make 24

sure that we answer that patient's question when they

25

1	call to schedule their appointment. So, thank you
2	for that.
3	DR. LEVY: Okay. We'll get
4	that over to you today.
5	DR. MUNSON: Okay. Thank you.
6	MS. ALLEN: Dr. Munson, we'll
7	get you the WellCare plan sheet and, then, we'll also
8	get it over to Sarah.
9	DR. MUNSON: Okay. Excellent.
10	And, then, one other thing someone with more
11	resources than me, I can give you guys the two codes
12	for Durysta. The J code is J3490 and, then, the
13	procedure code is 96372.
14	MS. ALLEN: Thank you.
15	DR. MUNSON: That's all I had,
16	Matt. Thank you.
17	DR. BURCHETT: Sounds good.
18	Anybody else?
19	If not, then, I will entertain
20	a motion to adjourn.
21	DR. MUNSON: I make a motion
22	that we adjourn.
23	DR. UPCHURCH: Second.
24	DR. BURCHETT: Thank you all.
25	MEETING ADJOURNED